



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,714	02/05/2002	Haim Ben-Ari	UTL 00123	1951
7590	06/23/2006		EXAMINER	
Kyocera Wireless Corp. Attn: Patent Department P.O. Box 928289 San Diego, CA 92192-8289			KIM, WESLEY LEO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/072,714

Applicant(s)

BEN-ARI, HAIM

Examiner

Wesley L. Kim

Art Unit

2617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 15 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.

GEORGE ENG

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The applicant argues that the Ghaem reference fails to teach "fixedly aligning the reference axis with the screen axis". The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant says that the "screen axis is fixedly aligned with a predetermined compass heading true north, i.e. reference axis 21" is incorrect, however from figure 1 it is clear that the reference axis 21 is a vector pointing to true north and is fixedly aligned with screen axis 18, according to the examiners interpretation as noted in the Final Office Action (4/19/06, Page 3 lines 3-16). The applicant is arguing that the specification teaches two axis will always point in the same direction. To this, the examiner would like to note that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The examiner bases the rejections solely on what is recited in the claim language and is given the right to interpret the claims with the broadest possible interpretation.

The applicant argues that Ghaem does not teach "displaying a direction associated with the references axis on the display/user-interface screen" (a display screen is a user-interface screen). The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant argues that Ghaem does not teach specifically displaying a alpha-numeric or numerical equivalent of the direction associated with the reference axis, to this the examiner responds by saying that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The examiner bases the rejections solely on what is recited in the claim language and is given the right to interpret the claims with the broadest possible interpretation. Therefore Ghaem does teach a direction associated with the reference axis on the display screen (Fig.1;19, the arrow is a displaying a direction).

The applicant argues that the examiners interpretation of "fixedly aligned" in the Final Office Action (4/19/06, Page 3 lines 3-16) is incorrect. The examiner respectfully disagrees. To this the examiner would like to note that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The examiner bases the rejections solely on what is recited in the claim language and is given the right to interpret the claims with the broadest possible interpretation.

The applicant argues that Maruyama and Ghaem fails to make out a prima facie case of obviousness and Ghaem fails to make up for the deficiencies of Maruyama. The examiner respectfully disagrees. To the examiner it would be obvious to combine Maruyama with Ghaem since both are teaching a mobile electronic device with direction finding capabilities and Ghaem teaches "fixedly aligning the reference axis with the screen axis". From figure 1 it is clear that the reference axis 21 is a vector pointing to true north and is fixedly aligned with screen axis 18, according to the examiners interpretation as noted in the Final Office Action (4/19/06, Page 3 lines 3-16). To this, the examiner would like to note that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The examiner bases the rejections solely on what is recited in the claim language and is given the right to interpret the claims with the broadest possible interpretation.

-- wlt.

